

If they intend to offer the amendments, we hope they are on their way to the floor or that their staffs will find them and get them to the floor of the Senate so they can do that. If they are deciding not to offer those amendments, please notify us. We want to go to third reading.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, to our knowledge, we have only two Senators on our side who said they have an amendment they want to offer. We are on the phone now to try to get them down here. But I think if we can get them down here quickly, we will be able to finish this bill by Friday.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if, in fact, there is a way to get to third reading, and then do a voice vote on final passage, of course we would prefer to do that as well. My expectation is we will have a recorded vote on the conference report when it comes back from the conference, but I do not know that that has yet been cleared. My understanding was that a voice vote had not been cleared some while ago.

In any event, if we can finish the amendments and get to third reading, it will have represented, in my judgment, significant progress. This is a fairly sizeable appropriations bill. The ability to do this bill today on the floor of the Senate would, I think, signal to the American people that this is a new seriousness of purpose in the Senate. We want to obviously do our business, and do it the right way, but we want to express to the American people that we are willing to work together and get things done.

This country suffers from a pretty serious crisis as a result of the terrorist acts. We want to demonstrate to the American people that we can go back to work and we can get this work done in an expeditious way.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a short period of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1438

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I understand that S. 1438, the Department of Defense authorization bill which I introduced a few minutes ago, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1438) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I object. And the reasons for the objection are as follows: That in consultation with the Republican leader, in consultation with the majority whip, and in consultation with the chairman, the chairman is seeking to have this piece of legislation be considered under rule XIV. We have no objection to that, but for technical reasons the objection to the second reading is required. It should not be interpreted—my objection—as animosity or anything between the chairman and myself. It is just part of the procedure, arcane though it may be.

So I object to second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

The Senator from Michigan.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1439

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I understand that S. 1439, the Ballistic Missile Defense Act of 2001, which I introduced a few minutes ago, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1439) to provide and revise conditions and requirements for the ballistic missile defense programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I object for the same reasons as I stated under S. 1438.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 1583

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of my colleagues Senator CLINTON, Senator SCHUMER, Senator DORGAN, Senator WARNER, and others, an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for Mrs. CLINTON, for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. HELMS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CHAFEE, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 1583.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Heroes Stamp Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT THAT A SPECIAL COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP BE DESIGNED AND ISSUED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to afford the public a direct and tangible way to provide assistance to the families of emergency relief personnel killed or permanently disabled in the line of duty in connection with the terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001, the United States Postal Service shall issue a semipostal in accordance with sub-section (b).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The provisions of section 416 of title 39, United States Code, shall apply as practicable with respect to the semipostal described in subsection (a), subject to the following:

(c) RATE OF POSTAGE.—Section 414(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "of not to exceed 25 percent" and inserting "of not less than 15 percent"; and

(2) by adding after the sentence following paragraph (3) the following: "The special rate of postage of an individual stamp under this section shall be an amount that is evenly divisible by 5."

(2) DISPOSITION OF AMOUNTS BECOMING AVAILABLE.—All amounts becoming available from the sale of the semipostal (as determined under such section) shall be transferred to the Federal Emergency Management Agency under such arrangements as the Postal Service shall be mutual agreement with such agency establish in order to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(3) COMMENCEMENT AND TERMINATION DATES.—Stamps under this section shall be issued—

(A) beginning on the earliest date practicable; and

(B) for such period of time as the Postal Service considers necessary and appropriate, but in no event less than 2 years.

"(g) For purposes of section 416 (including any regulation prescribed under subsection

(e)(1)(C) of that section), the special postage stamp issued under this section shall not apply to any limitation relating to whether more than 1 semipostal may be offered for sale at the same time."

(c) DESIGN.—It is the sense of the Congress that the semipostal issued under this section should depict, by such design as the Postal Service considers to be most appropriate, the efforts of emergency relief personnel at the site of the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "emergency relief personnel" means firefighters, law enforcement officers, paramedics, emergency medical technicians, members of the clergy, and other individuals (including employees of legally organized and recognized volunteer organizations, whether compensated or not) who, in the course of professional duties, respond to fire, medical, hazardous material, or other similar emergencies; and

(2) the term "semipostal" has the meaning given such term by section 416 of title 39, United States Code.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared by myself and our side. Also, I understand it has been cleared by the Republican side. I ask the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Hearing no objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1583) was agreed to.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding is we are waiting for Senator HATCH who will be offering an amendment. That amendment is on the way to the floor. We have discussed that amendment. We will be accepting it. I expect it will take just a few moments. And when that amendment is accepted, I think at this point we are ready to go to third reading of the bill. We will see at that point whether we need a recorded vote on the bill. It would be nice to be able to finish this appropriations bill this evening.

As soon as we receive the amendment, it is our intention to accept the amendment and move to third reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I concur with the chairman. If we can finish this last amendment, I don't know if there are any other outstanding issues. If not, we are now checking with the leadership to see if it will be accepted to move this bill tonight.

Mr. DORGAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1584

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, Senator CAMPBELL and I, on behalf of our colleague, Senator HATCH, send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 1584.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To designate the State of Utah as a High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area)

On page 36, line 7, after the semicolon insert the following: "of which \$2,500,000 shall be used for a newly designated HIDTA in the State of Utah."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on adoption of the amendment.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we have reviewed the amendment and have no objection on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have no objection on our side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no objection to the immediate consideration of the amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1584) was agreed to.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I believe the amendment we just considered by Senator HATCH is the last amendment to be offered to this bill. I believe on our side there are no further amendments. I believe that is the case on the Republican side.

ISSUANCE OF SEMIPOSTAL STAMPS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee. First, I would like to commend the Chairman for his good work on this bill. I appreciate his leadership and commitment.

I would like to confirm with the chairman my understanding of an amendment offered by the chairman and Senators CLINTON and SCHUMER. The amendment proposes that a special commemorative semipostal stamp be issued to recognize the efforts of the

brave emergency relief personnel who were killed in connection with last week's terrorist attacks.

Existing Postal Service regulations state that the Postal Service will offer only one semipostal stamp for sale at any given time. It is my understanding that it would be consistent with these regulations for the Postal Service to designate the commemorative stamp created by the amendment as the one semipostal stamp to be offered, pursuant to the said regulations, for the period specified in the amendment, with the exception of the Breast Cancer Research Stamp previously exempted by law.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. The Postal Service could choose to designate the emergency relief semipostal as the one semipostal stamp to be offered for the period specified in the amendment, pursuant to Postal Service regulations.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of contraceptive coverage for almost 9 million Federal employees and their dependents who receive their health care coverage through the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. At a negligible cost, this coverage has been included in the past three Treasury-Postal appropriations bills and is in the House passed bill and as well as the legislation before us today.

This provision enjoys broad bipartisan support among members of the Senate as demonstrated by a letter sent by over half of the Members of the Senate to the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government.

This contraceptive coverage provision was adapted from legislation I originally authored back in 1997, the bipartisan Equity in Prescription Contraceptive Coverage Act, or EPICC, which currently has 42 cosponsors, and which was the subject of a hearing in the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee on September 10. Throughout this effort, I have had the good fortune of being joined by Senator REID who has been a partner with me in this effort, and I thank him for his ongoing leadership on this issue. We both agree this is commonsense public policy whose time has long since come.

The facts are not in dispute, contraceptives are an essential part of not only a woman's health, but that of her children and her future children. The lack of equitable coverage of prescription contraceptives has a very real impact on the lives of America's women and, therefore, our society as a whole. We took a strong first step towards ending this inequity when, in 1998, we guaranteed access to prescription contraceptive coverage for federal employees.

The inclusion of this coverage in FEHBP has saved female enrollees over

\$1,000 over the past three years, according to the Alan Guttmacher Institute. Not only has the inclusion of this coverage saved our female employees about \$350 a year, it has not cost the Federal government anything either. A January 2001 OPM statement on the cost of this coverage for federal employees under the FEHBP found no effect on premiums whatsoever since implementation in 1998. Since it's not often that we can say that, let me repeat it, it has had no effect on costs of health care.

In fact, some, like the Alan Guttmacher Institute, argue that improved access to and use of contraception nationwide saves insurers and society money by preventing unintended pregnancies, as insurers generally pay pregnancy-related medical costs, which can range anywhere from \$5,000 to almost \$9,000. Improved access to contraception would eliminate these costs and would reduce the costs to both employers and insurers.

Whenever we talk about contraceptive coverage, the issue of a "conscience clause" has continually been raised. I would remind my colleagues that this is a concern we effectively addressed in 1998 and that standard has remained unchanged ever since. I agree that this is a legitimate concern, which is why we found a compromise in order to assuage the concerns of our colleagues who felt that there needed to be a "conscience clause" to allow religious plans to opt out of this coverage if their beliefs and tenets are not consistent with this coverage. Originally, we specifically named five health plans that were excluded from having to provide this coverage and allowed "any other existing or future religious based plans whose religious tenets are in conflict with the requirements" of this coverage. Three years later, there are only two plans remaining in the FEHB program which do not provide this coverage. That's two out of over 245 participating health plans.

While many of my colleagues and I would prefer to have this coverage expanded for all women nationwide, it is essential that we do not rescind this critical health care benefit for women in the FEHB program. And the proponents of the larger legislation, EPICC, are not alone.

As recently as June, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington ruled in *Erickson v. Bartell Drug Company* that an employer's failure to cover prescription contraceptives in its otherwise comprehensive prescription drug plan constitutes gender discrimination, in violation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This case was the first of its kind, setting a legal precedent as well as bolstering the case for our broader legislation.

In turn, the foundation for the district court decision was a ruling by the Equal Employment Opportunities Com-

mission, or EEOC, last December that an employer's decision to exclude coverage of contraceptives in a health plan that covered other prescription drugs, devices and preventive health care services violated title VII of the Civil Rights Act regarding gender discrimination.

Together, these two decisions form a "one-two" punch in favor of the approach we advocate today, an approach that's already been endorsed by a total of 16 States, including my home State of Maine—that have passed similar laws since 1998. Today, another *twenty States* have contraceptive coverage legislation pending. That's a start, but it's not enough. Not only are these laws limited to state regulated plans, but this piecemeal approach to fairness leaves many American women at the mercy of geography when it comes to the coverage they deserve. Unfortunately, until we can get EPICC passed on its own, you either have to be a member of Congress, a Senator, a Federal employee, or living in one of these states to receive this guaranteed benefit.

We believe that contraceptive coverage not only makes sense in terms of the cost of contraceptives for women, but also as a means bridging, at least in some small way, the pro-choice pro-life chasm by helping prevent unintended pregnancies and thereby *also* prevent abortions. The fact of the matter is, we know that there are three million unintended pregnancies every year in the United States. We also know that almost *half* of those pregnancies result from just three million women who do *not* use contraceptives, while *39 million* contraceptive users account for the other 53 percent of unintended pregnancies, most of which resulted from inconsistent or incorrect use. In other words, when used properly, contraceptives *work*. We know that they prevent unintended pregnancies and when we have fewer unintended pregnancies, we will have a reduced need for abortions, and that is a goal each of us can support.

I ask my colleagues to continue to support the inclusion of this provision in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program as contained in the Fiscal Year 2002 Treasury-Postal appropriations bill. It is an important benefit and it is in the best interests of women's overall health, their children and their future children's health.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the managers of this bill for their hard work in putting forth this legislation which provides Federal funding for numerous vital programs in the Treasury Department and the General Government. However, once again, I find myself in the unpleasant position of speaking before my colleagues about parochial projects in another appropriations bill.

This bill spends at a level 5.9 percent higher than the level enacted in fiscal

year 2001, which is greater than the 4 percent increase in discretionary spending than the President wanted to adhere to.

In real dollars, this is \$328 million in additional spending above the amount requested by the President, and a \$1.8 billion increase in spending from last year. So far this year, with just seven appropriations bills already passed including this bill, spending levels have already exceeded the President's budget request by more than \$7.6 billion. I must remind my colleagues that the Administration has urged us to maintain our fiscal discipline to ensure that we will continue to have adequate funds to prosecute our war against terrorism, to aid those in need, and to cover other related costs.

In this bill, I have identified just over \$200 million in earmarks, which is less than the cost of the earmarks, totaling \$356 million, in the bill passed last year. Therefore, I applaud the efforts of the appropriators in keeping parochial spending to a minimum in this bill but more must be done.

While the amounts associated with each individual earmark may not seem extravagant, taken together, they represent a serious diversion of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars at the expense of numerous programs that have undergone the appropriate merit-based selection process. It is my view that the people who run these programs should be the ones who decide how best to spend the appropriated funds. After all, they know what their most pressing needs are.

For example, under funding for the Department of Treasury, some examples of earmarks include: \$1,000,000 for work on joint technology projects with New Mexico State University's Physical Sciences Laboratory; and \$750,000 for the Center for Agriculture Policy and Trade Studies located at North Dakota State University.

Under funding for the General Government, some of the earmarks include: \$2,500,000 for the Native American Digital Telehealth Project and the Upper Great Plains Native American Telehealth Program at the University of North Dakota; and \$5,000,000 to help purchase land and facilitate the moving of the Odd Fellows Hall to provide for construction of a new courthouse in Salt Lake City, UT.

There are more projects on the list that I have compiled, which will be available on my Senate Web site.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to curb our habit of directing hard-earned taxpayer dollars to locality-specific special interests.

POSTAL SERVICE SORTING PRACTICES IN HAWAII

Mr. DORGAN. I understand that as a result of the closure of our nation's airports and the limitations placed on the carriage of cargo on commercial passenger planes, postal service throughout our country was affected. However,

the State of Hawaii was impacted most severely. My colleague from Hawaii, Senator INOUE, has joined me to discuss the situation in Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. I thank Senator DORGAN for the opportunity to share with our colleagues the impact of the air service restrictions on the delivery of mail in the State of Hawaii. The recent closure of our Nation's air transportation system brought to light a Postal Service practice that I believe should be reevaluated. Hawaii is an island State that is not only geographically isolated from the mainland United States, but that is also geographically divided into seven distinct islands separated by the Pacific Ocean. Hawaii has a population dependent on the air transportation system for the movement of goods and people throughout the State. However, I believe the current Postal Service mail sorting procedure has the potential to exacerbate the harm to my State's economy from the airport closures, the reduced inter-island travel, and the decline in travel to and from my State.

The Postal Service in Hawaii has only one centralized sorting office. While I understand that mail service throughout the United States experienced slow-downs and difficulties as a result of the closure of our air transportation system, mail service in Hawaii came to a virtual standstill. The shut down of our airports resulted in the delivery of mail only on the island of Oahu, where the sorting station is located. My constituents on Maui could not mail letters to one another because a letter originating on Maui and addressed to another location on Maui must first be flown to Honolulu for sorting. This hardship was faced by all the residents of Oahu's neighbor islands.

With the threat of war upon us and the possibility of further airport closures, I believe we must study alternatives to the current mail sorting system. The problems faced by the neighbor islands as a result of the airport shutdown are expected to continue as tourism to and within Hawaii declines. Aloha Airlines, one of two island air carriers, has announced a 26-percent reduction in flights that will begin next week. Hawaiian Airlines, the other inter-island air carrier has also dramatically reduced its flight schedule. Additional flights will likely be eliminated with the expected continued decline in leisure and business travel.

In light of these flight restrictions, I believe the Postal Service should develop a procedure by which mail that originates on the same island to which it is addressed can be kept and sorted on that island. I realize that this would be only a small step toward addressing the many issues resulting from my State's unique geography, but it would be a start.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank Senator INOUE for sharing with us the difficul-

ties faced by your State. I agree that the Postal Service should examine the feasibility of implementing procedures that take into account Hawaii's unique geography. Please be assured that I will work with the Senator to help in this endeavor.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise to offer for the RECORD the Budget Committee's official scoring for S. 1398, the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002.

The Senate bill provides \$17.118 billion in discretionary budget authority, which will result in new outlays in 2002 of \$12.528 billion. When outlays from prior-year budget authority are taken into account, discretionary outlays for the Senate bill total \$16.183 billion in 2002. The Senate bill is within its Section 302(b) allocation for budget authority and outlays. Once again, the committee has met its target without the use of any emergency designations.

I again commend Chairman BYRD and Senator STEVENS, as well as Senators DORGAN and CAMPBELL, for their bipartisan effort in moving this and other appropriations bills quickly to make up for the late start in this year's appropriations process. The tragic events of September 11 demand that this bipartisanship continue and that the Congress expeditiously complete work on the 13 regular appropriation bills for 2002.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the budget committee scoring of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1398, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL
GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATION, 2002

(Spending comparisons—Senate-reported bill (in millions of dollars))

	General purpose	Manda- tory	Total
Senate-reported bill:			
Budget Authority	17,118	15,478	32,596
Outlays	16,183	15,475	31,658
Senate 302(b) allocation ¹ :			
Budget Authority	17,118	15,478	32,596
Outlays	16,183	15,475	31,658
House-passed:			
Budget Authority	17,022	15,478	32,500
Outlays	16,261	15,475	31,736
President's request:			
Budget Authority	16,614	15,478	32,092
Outlays	15,974	15,475	31,449
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:			
Senate 302(b) allocation ¹ :			
Budget Authority
Outlays
House-passed:			
Budget Authority	96	96
Outlays	(78)	(78)
President's request:			
Budget Authority	504	504
Outlays	209	209

¹ For enforcement purposes, the budget committee compares the Senate-reported bill to the Senate 302(b) allocation.

NOTES: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any further amendments? If not, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 2590) was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. DORGAN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order previously entered, the Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair is authorized to appoint the following conferees.

The President pro tempore appointed Mr. DORGAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. REED, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. STEVENS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, this bill must have gone through in record fashion. I note for the record this is the first year Senator DORGAN has been chairman of the subcommittee. I have really enjoyed working with him, and I am continually awed by his skills in the Chamber of this great body and his ability to get this bill together in a timely fashion. I thank him and his staff for working so well with us. From my staff, Pat Raymond and Lula Edwards worked hard on our side. I thank them, too, for the record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me say again what a pleasure it is to work with Senator CAMPBELL, his staff and my staff who I named previously today. They have done an excellent job. We passed this bill in fairly short order. As I said when we started today, I hope we could perhaps show the American people that we are back at work and trying to do things in a way that allows all of us to work together for the interest of this country, and I believe the passage of this bill in the manner we have done tonight is a demonstration of that.

Again, I thank my colleague and all of our Senate colleagues for cooperating and allowing us to get to the point of passing this important legislation this evening. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, while the chairman of the full committee is here and two managers of the bill, I congratulate them and you. The appropriations process is moving along, and we should all feel very good about that.

Senator DORGAN and Senator CAMPBELL have done a tremendous job on a

very difficult bill that will go a long way toward solving many problems of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DORGAN). Who seeks recognition?

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for a period not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will soon begin consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002. This bill would authorize \$343.5 billion for national defense programs, the full amount requested by the administration, including the \$18.4 billion requested by the President in his amended budget request.

The bill would also address a number of important priorities identified by the Armed Services Committee, adding significant funding for military compensation and quality of life, the readiness and transformation of the military services, and the capability of our armed forces to meet nontraditional threats, including terrorism. In light of recent events, we will obviously do more, as we already have, with the enactment of the \$40 billion emergency supplemental appropriation bill last week. However, these are no ordinary times, and the debate on this bill will be no ordinary debate. Debate on a bill like this is an inherent part of our democracy, and while our democratic institutions are stronger than any terrorist attack, in one regard we operate differently in times of national emergency. We strive to set aside our differences, and ask decent people everywhere to join forces with us to seek out and to defeat the common enemy of the civilized world.

For this reason, I am today introducing two new bills. The first bill is identical to S. 1416, as reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee in every respect but one—the removal of legislative language dealing with missile defense. The second bill, which would be deferred for debate at a later and more appropriate time, would include the missile defense language.

I strongly believe that the missile defense provisions took an appropriate step on an issue of national importance, and I was disappointed that this single area of disagreement led the Republican Members of our committee to vote against this bill that is so important to our national security.

In my view, however, this is the wrong time for divisive debate on issues of national defense. We cannot let issues like this pull us apart and undermine our common sense of national purpose in fighting terrorism. Rather, we should leave this debate to a later time and link arms against our attackers.

When we take up the defense authorization act, I hope that my colleagues will join me in putting controversial issues aside and help us move forward together to pass this bill promptly and indicate our strong and unified support for the national defense with a minimum of divisive debate.

THE HAPPY HOOLIGANS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to comment for a moment about some fighter pilots who are flying air missions over our nation's capital.

On Tuesday of last week, following the attack on the World Trade Center and shortly before the Pentagon was hit, a detachment of fighters who were on alert at Langley Air Force Base in Virginia were ordered airborne to protect the nation's capital. It happens that the detachment of fighters is from North Dakota.

The 119th Tactical Fighter Wing of the North Dakota Air National Guard flies F-16s. They are called the Happy Hooligans. The Happy Hooligans are folks who farm; they run drug stores; they teach school. They do a lot of things in their community, but they also are members of the National Guard who maintain and fly F-16s. More than that, the Happy Hooligans, the National Air Guard detachment in Fargo, ND, are some of the best fighter pilots in the world. In fact, the Happy Hooligans have won the William Tell Award on several occasions.

The William Tell Award is an award that is given to the fighter units that are the most proficient combat fighter pilots in the world.

So this National Guard unit from Fargo, ND, has taken their airplanes to the William Tell contest, and they have flown against the world's top combat pilots, and they have brought the William Tell Award home to Fargo, ND, as proof that they are the best fighter pilots in the world.

For some time, the Happy Hooligans have kept a permanent detachment with four F-16s, pilots, and crews on alert at Langley Air Force Base to provide air defense of the United States.

Last Tuesday morning, the attack on the World Trade Center in New York

precipitated an order for those fighters who were on alert to take to the skies. And those F-16s took to the air, but regrettably they were not yet over Washington's airspace when the airplane hit the Pentagon. They were still some minutes away.

But they then flew, as I understand it, 7 hours that day over the skies of Washington, DC, performing combat air patrol and protecting our nation's capital. And these are, as I said, men and women who belong to the National Guard but who have been awarded the distinction of being the best fighter pilots in the world.

I was enormously proud of them. I called their commander at Langley. I told them how proud I was to have the Happy Hooligans—a wonderful contingent of civilian soldiers; men and women who belong to the National Guard—flying those F-16s, providing air cover during a time of national emergency.

So, for the record, I want to say that all Americans, of course, are proud of our men and women in uniform. We grieve with them for the tragedy visited upon them when the airplane was flown into the Pentagon, just as we do for the thousands of people who have lost their lives at the World Trade Center.

And as there are brave men and women across the country who have stepped forward to say, let it be me—the firemen and the firefighters and police men and women who were climbing the stairs of the World Trade Center to try to rescue people, risking their lives to help others, just as there are so many heroes around this country during a time of need—so, too, were the Happy Hooligans in their cockpit of the F-16s, flying combat air patrols over our Nation's Capital.

Let me say to the Happy Hooligans: I salute you. I am proud of your work. And this country owes you a great debt of gratitude.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I say to my friend and colleague from North Dakota, in relation to his eloquent remarks about the Happy Hooligans, we are glad the Happy Hooligans are on our side. I knew that this training was going on. These Air Guardsmen—and possibly women as well—were very important in scrambling to protect our Nation's Capital. I know of one of those pilots actually who is from Virginia.

I am not going to get into the details because it is important for national security not to reveal what they were doing, but they were very much in harm's way. I will not get into any more detail other than to say, these pilots—the Happy Hooligans, and any others who were involved in that scrambled mission to protect our Nation's Capital, and the region here in the DC area—really were willing to give their lives in a generally undefended position.